

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/029,961	KIM, JAI-YOUNG	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Louis Falasco	1773	

**All Participants:**

 (1) Louis Falasco.

 (2) Stephen J. Tytran.
**Status of Application: Pending**

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 29 June 2004
**Time:** 2:30pm
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Under 35 USC 112

Claims discussed:

1,3-11

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet
**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:  
Claims 7 was indicated as allowed.

The examiner pointed out they were commensurate in scope with the disclosure, noting the example of the specification. Though the prior art included a composition like that of the allowed claims, the thickness was not specified in the art and applicants provided evidence of unexpected results over the prior art, illustrated by comparison in FIGs 3-11, within a range more narrow than specified the prior art range.